

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and claims 4, 6, 22 and 23 have been amended. Claims 1, 4-23 and 26-39 are pending and under consideration.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

Paragraph [0061] of the specification was objected to because of an informality. Appropriate correction has been made to paragraph [0061] in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 6 was objected to because of an informality. Appropriate correction has been made to claim 6 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 112, first paragraph

Claims 1, 4-23 and 26-39 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner noted that the limitation in independent claims 1, 22 and 23 where the rotation control unit is moveably connected to the base hinge is not in the specification. In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, paragraph [0046] of the specification has been amended to disclose that "[t]he rotation control unit 50 is moveably connected to the stand bracket 20 and the base bracket 30 of the base hinge 15."

Support for this amendment to the specification may be found in at least Figures 3, 4 and 6 of the present application as originally filed. In accordance with MPEP 2163.06, it is respectfully submitted that this amendment to the specification does not constitute new matter because information contained in any one of the specification, claims or drawings of the application as filed may be added to any other part of the application without introducing new matter.

Claims 22 and 23 were further rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, in their previous form claims 22 and 23 appeared to recite two stands. Appropriate correction has been made to claims 22 and 23 so that the one stand supported in the specification is recited in claims 22 and 23.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 1, 4-23 and 26-39 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, have been overcome.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 112, second paragraph

Claims 4-8 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner noted that claims 4 and 5 contained claim terms that lacked antecedent basis. To correct this, claim 4 was amended to depend from claim 37 instead of claim 36. This amendment to claim 4 also solves the antecedent basis issue with claim 5.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 4-8 and 10 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, have been overcome.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 14, 2007

By: / Gregory W. Harper /
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501